DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 917 HE 025 841

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE Report on the '92 Seoul International Conference on the Role of the University Education in the Asia/Pacific Age (Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 8-10, 1992).
PUB DATE Jun 92
NOTE 46p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; Conferences; Foreign Countries; Foreign Students; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; *International Cooperation; *International Educational Exchange; School Business Relationship; Student Mobility; Teacher Exchange Programs; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Asia Pacific Region

ABSTRACT

This report, by the U.S. representative to the conference, presents observations on and basic results of the 1992 Seoul International Conference on the Role of the University in the Asia/Pacific Age, as well as the conference agenda and program, the minutes of the meeting, and other related documents. The conference convened 51 representatives from 18 countries in the Asia/Pacific region, as well as the United States and 2 international organizations, to examine the most appropriate ways of increasing the cooperation between the higher education institutions in the region. Topics of the meetings included faculty and student exchange among the universities, the exchange of academic information among international universities, and means of enhancing mutual cooperation between universities and business/industry. The paper concludes with brief observations concerning the need for the United States to actively sponsor students and staff in Asia and the Pacific Rim countries, and research needs in such areas as orientation of foreign students. Appendices contain a questionnaire survey on the impediments to university student exchange, a list of the participants and observers, and the framework of University Mobility in the Asia/Pacific trial programs. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349917

REPORT ON THE '92 SEOUL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC AGE

APRIL 8-10, 1992

Convention Center SEOUL HILTON INTERNATIONAL

Hosted by

THE KOREAN COUNCIL FOR UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Sponsored by

THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION - REPUBLIC OF KOREA

FEDERATION OF KOREAN INDUSTRIES

By

DR. ROBERT A. SCOTT

President, Ramapo College of New Jersey

Chairman, Commission on International Education
American Council on Education (ACE)

Official U. S. Delegate Sponsored by
The Korean-American (Fulbright) Commission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☆ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE025841

Revised June 8, 1992. Draft of May 8, 1992 reviewed by various U. S. and Korea-based readers for accuracy and clarity.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT ON THE '92 SEOUL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

ON

THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC AGE

By

DR. ROBERT A. SCOTT

President, Ramapo College of New Jersey

Chairman, Commission on International Education
American Council on Education (ACE)

Official U. S. Delegate Sponsored by
The Korean-American (Fulbright) Commission

Introduction

From April 8 through 10, 1992 I served as the Official U. S. Conference Delegate at the '92 Seoul International Conference on The Role of University Education in the Asia/Pacific Age. Mr. Frederick Carriere, Executive Director, Korean-American Educational (Fulbright) Commission, served as my sponsor and host. The agenda, conference program and minutes of the meeting and related documents are attached.

The '92 Seoul International Conference followed several earlier meetings to discuss increased student and staff mobility between and among universities in the Asian/Pacific nations. The first meeting was held in Hong Kong in April, 1991. It appears that the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee played a major role in convening the discussion of five nations to deliberate on a set of principles for increased mobility. In September 1991, 52 delegates and observers from some 18 countries and territories in the Asia/Pacific region participated in a conference held in Canberra, Australia. The purpose was to assess the amount of cooperation already existing between and among tertiary (higher education) institutions in the region, to decide whether it would be appropriate to increase this cooperation, and to determine suitable ways to expand cooperation and to increase its effectiveness. Participants at the September, 1991 meeting represented universities in Australia, Brunei, Cambodia, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Laos, Mandalay, Mayanmar, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, The People's Republic of China, The Republic of China, The Republic of the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, and the

Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning. At this meeting a group of delegates was elected to form a working committee which met in Bangkok, Thailand in December, 1991. The work of this committee was presented for discussion at the April, 1992 Seoul International Conference.

The '92 Seoul International Conference

The Seoul Conference consisted of 51 participants from 18 countries, including the United States, and two international organizations. It was explained to me that at some point after the Bangkok meeting it was suggested that a delegate from the United States be invited to attend.[1] Actually, there were several Americans in attendance because David Gardner, President of the University of California, was in Seoul for a separate meeting of Pacific Rim urban university presidents and Professor Edward Beauchamp of the University of Hawaii was sent by his university to observe. Based on his projected attendance and his acquaintance with several of the organizers, he was also asked to give a paper as was Dr. Gardner.

Following formal presentations on Wednesday afternoon, April 8, the morning of Thursday, April 9 was devoted to three simultaneous group sessions discussing particular topics, including "The Exchange of Faculty and Students Among Universities," "International Exchange of Academic Information Among Universities," and "Enhancement of Mutual Cooperation between Universities and Business/Industry." (A copy of the Conference Program is attached as "**A**".) I attended the first session and participated actively. The afternoon of Thursday, April 9, was devoted to a meeting of the Reference Group which consists of the official delegates. Others were excused for the afternoon unless they wished to sit as observers. All conference participants were reconvened in the evening at a formal dinner.

---

[1]After consulting with The Council for International Exchange of Scholars about appropriate U. S. presidential-level participation, Fred Carriere invited this reporter to attend.

A copy of the formal agenda for the Reference Group[2] meeting is attached as **"B"**. The actual items under discussion are being revised in accordance with the discussion, at which several key decisions were taken. (The minutes are now attached as **"C"** to indicate the final formal positions). In summary, these decisions are as follows:

1. There was considerable discussion about whether the acronym UMAPS standing for "University Mobility in the Asia/Pacific Scheme," should be used in preference to UMAP which was tentatively agreed upon at the Canberra Conference. Several participants thought that the word "scheme" carried a negative connotation, even though it was used in a different manner by European nations and even appears in the name of ERASMUS. The Group settled on UMAP.

2. It was decided that the Working Party would take steps to identify existing agreements for student and staff mobility between and among institutions and governments which can serve as models that others could follow. A set of actual agreements had been distributed to conference participants prior to attendance and it was decided to add others in order to develop a more fully expanded resource document. It was emphasized that the "models" or frameworks identified or created would not be used for purposes of "control." There is an obvious role for ACE in this effort.

3. It was decided to continue to identify "impediments" to increased student and staff mobility and to identify solutions to be used by both sending and receiving institutions. While it was stated that any impediments can be overcome through bilateral discussions, and that there should be no reason to emphasize impediments, it was thought useful to find and identify models of solutions. A subcommittee was appointed to develop these materials. (The questionnaire is attaced as **"D"**.)

---

[2]The Term "Reference Group" refers to the delegates at large; the term "Working Party" refers to a sub-group which was appointed to prepare materials for discussion and action by the Reference Group.

4. The statement of objectives for UMAP which had been approved by the Working Party was found, in general, to be acceptable. The Australian government has provided $200,000 to finance the start of the organization and to fund a secretariat. The secretariat was not defined as to composition; it seemed clear it would be located in Australia. It was emphasized that the body does not wish to create a central bureaucracy and does not intend to build a structure as formal as ERASMUS, in part because ERASMUS follows a formal governmental economic agreement. It also was emphasized that the Asian/Pacific Rim mobility partnership should make it possible for students from the less developed nations to participate.

5. It was decided to identify some projects for increased mobility and to assess useful formats and models for the region. This would help in determining the format for a more permanent system of extending and enhancing higher education cooperation in the region.

6. There was considerable discussion about the proposed "framework" recommended by the Working Party. In part, the discussion centered around the desirability of taking some formal action to create a framework, but many expressed concerns about voting on a document that was to be amended significantly following the general discussion at the Reference Group session.

In addition, the Working Party document recommended annual dues of $10,000-$20,000 which was considered extremely expensive by a number of the institutions. This discussion highlighted a significant dilemma posed by the Working Party document but apparently not recognized by it. The Working Party assumed that any "dues" would be paid by governments yet there is no formal way of requesting such governmental support and there is no inclination to have governments play a role in determining which institutions would serve as delegates.

Furthermore, it was not decided how the dues would be divided among institutions, if at all, if there were two or more institutions from a nation

represented in the Reference Group. (It was clear that the Australians were pushing this notion aggressively in an attempt to show their government that its commitment of $200,000 was being matched at least to some extent by the other nations.) The final resolution on "dues" and assessments reduced the amount to approximately $500 and will be given further discussion by the Working Party which was to meet following dinner on Thursday, April 9.

Another decision was made concerning the promotion of UMAP among area institutions and governments. Some delegates expressed concern about promoting a document which they will not have seen because it is to be revised. However, most people generally agreed that the notion could be promoted without circulating a formal document.

It was indicated that APEC (the Asian/Pacific Economic Conference) includes ten working groups including one on human development, which would be a natural for affiliation with UMAP.

In addition, it was indicated that the APEC Education Ministers will meet in Washington, D.C. in Summer, 1992, and were expected to meet with President Bush. Either prior to or during the Washington, D.C. meetings, the Education Ministers will be asked to endorse UMAP.

The next meeting of the Reference Group (the full assembly) is scheduled for late April, 1993, at the National Taiwan University in Taipei, Taiwan. The Working Party will meet several times to refine the text of documents following the decisions made by the Reference Group and then would be reconstituted based on the revised membership. It was agreed that the Working Party should consist only of institutions willing to participate in the trial programs.

Observations

The Conference topic was enormously important and should be understood within the context of similar discussions taking place in the Americas (between and among university leaders in Canada, Mexico, and the United States), and in Europe (ERASMUS and TEMPUS). While the leaders of the Seoul Conference stated that their discussions were

different because they do not follow from formal government-endorsed trade agreements, I think this begs the question of the role of APEC and the clear indication that several of the participating governments, including Australia, Japan, and Korea, have strong economic interests in the development of greater mobility within the Asian/Pacific Rim.

During the speeches and discussions there was a great deal of subtlety and wit, and the occasional tweak at Japan. The Japanese showed sensitivity however by the President of the University of Tokyo (1) offering an apology to the Koreans for his country's past behavior toward Korea, as part of his otherwise formal address on the topic of the Conference, and (2) while serving as chief judge of the song contest following the farewell dinner, during which he ensured that the major prizes went to representatives from Papua New Guinea, Cambodia, Mongolia, and Korea.

The Australians seemed to play an unusually aggressive role in the Conference. I believe I am not overstating this, although clearly the exuberant western style of the Australians contrasted sharply with the more quiet demeanor of the Asian participants. Nevertheless, it was in deed as much as in word that the Australians pushed several key points and served as leaders of the Conference. Side conversations indicated that the Australians have government support because they are aggressively recruiting students for their universities and to serve as future scientists, engineers, managers, and professionals.[3] It also was speculated that the Japanese have an equally aggressive agenda; indeed, the president of the University of Tokyo announced a goal of 100,000 foreign students in Japan each year by the year 2000.

There are substantial barriers or impediments to increased exchanges and student/faculty mobility within the region. The list of impediments is long and complex. It includes issues such as the academic year calendar; the language for instruction; recognition of professional licensure; receptivity to foreigners; gender, race, ethnic and nationality bias; concerns about the unequal balance of student trade; types and availability of university housing; a lack of experience in receiving students from any other institution, including

---

[3]In this regard, it was interesting to read that the Australian government is working directly with the U. S. White House and the Secretary of Education on a bilateral agreement to increase student flow between the U. S. and Australia. An office has been opened in Washington, D.C. (See "Dispatch Case," The Chronicle of Higher Education, June 3, 1992, p. A33.)

other universities within the same nation; the differences in university missions and status; the recognition of courses and the transfer of credit; examination systems; social accommodation on campus and in the towns; cost, financial aid, and work permits; availability of advising and counseling; funding faculty replacements; support for faculty on leave at another institution; opportunities for a visiting student's or faculty spouse to work, etc. A great many of these impediments were acknowledged, but the spirit of the Conference was that barriers can be overcome by mutual agreement of institutions that place high priority on a bilateral agreement.

While this thinking is ambitious, I was disappointed that more attention was not given to establishing priorities for staff and student exchanges, partnerships between and among universities in the more-and less-developed countries, the issue of the "balance" of student trade, what to do if large numbers of students from less-developed countries decide to stay in the more-developed countries following a period of university study, and the relationship of UMAP to ERASMUS, TEMPUS, and "COLUMBUS."[4] These issues were not seen as relevant or important to the current discussion.

The Australians in particular were emphatic about not wanting government involvement except for the provision of funds, and emphasizing the ability of bilateral agreements to solve the problems of impediments. This led one participant to ask about the purpose of UMAP if it were simply to be a series of bilateral agreements. Others commented on the difficulty of gaining financial support from governments without granting them a role.

An interesting issue to contemplate is the effect of UMAP on the enrollment of foreign students in the United States. At present, some 50 per cent of the 400,000+ international students studying at U. S. colleges and universities come from Asia. If UMAP is successful and if individual nations adopt aggressive goals such as those expressed by Japan and Australia, then one could imagine an impact on U. S. enrollments. Given the

---

[4]"Columbus" often is used as a term to describe a goal for increased student/faculty mobility between and among institutions of higher education in Canada, Mexico, and the United States.

importance of international student enrollment in graduate programs, especially in engineering and the sciences, this could have significant impact.[5]

Also, there was sentiment expressed that the U. S. did not support foreign students and foreign study to the degree that other nations were now deciding to do. For example, it was pointed out that only about 70,000 of its students study abroad, and that many state legislators complain about subsidized tuition rates for students from other countries, even while U. S. institutions enroll over 400,000 students from other countries. This inequity in the balance of student enrollments was mentioned several times.

Listening to the opening plenary session speeches was an exciting experience. I have been an advocate for international education for years, and have worked with my colleagues on the Commission on International Education of ACE and on the Committee on International Programs of AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) to advance the arguments for international education. It was exciting to hear people from Australia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, as well as other nations use the same arguments for much the same reason--the preparation of students for an increasingly interdependent world. However, it then was striking to hear Asian representatives espouse their arguments on behalf of international education and contrast it with their interpretation of the United States commitment. According to these speakers, Asians emphasize international education for reasons of mutual cooperation, understanding, and friendship while the United States focuses on issues of economic competition. This issue of mutual respect can be related to the fact that the U. S. receives about six students for every one that it sends.

It also was interesting to hear the Australian Education Minister discuss foreign students as "service exports" in a manner similar to what I expressed in a paper I delivered several years ago on export services. (See Attachment "E")

---

[5]An alternative view is that Japan and Australia, at present, are the only real competitors to the U. S. , especially for graduate students. According to this view, while UMAP itself does not represent a serious new competitor for international students, Australia, Japan, and Korea may well be major challenges in the future, even without UMAP.

There were other comments about the United States, such as that offered by the Thai speaker who wondered why students from Asia would go to the United States to study Chinese language or culture when they could go to China. A similar, may I say "naive," comment was made by a U. S. speaker who stated that we have delayed so long in encouraging international exchanges because of the oceans which serve as barriers. I reminded the speaker that the borders between Canada and the U. S. and the U. S. and Mexico are among the most permeable in the world.

I concluded that we must be more active in sponsoring students and staff to Asia and Pacific Rim countries. We also need a new vocabulary to help our discussions on these topics. We tend to talk about minorities, and yet we have places in our country where minorities are a majority and other places where there is no "majority." We also need to get our geography straight. We often refer to the Far East, yet this part of the world is actually California's "Near West." The same would hold true for Mexico and Canada. Think of how we would sound when talking about exchanges with Pacific Rim countries if we talked about the Far East with them. Our Asian and Pacific Rim colleagues also need to acknowledge that the Pacific has two sides and that the west coast of Latin America, the eastern part of Russia, and many other places also are part of the Pacific World.

Research Needs

There was very little discussion about research topics related to UMAP, but several come to my mind. We need new models for the orientation of students to a host country, and new models that vary by length of time and intensity for preparing students in a new language, history, and culture. We also need expanded and new models of orientation for reentry to one's home country as well as models of financing exchanges of students and staff. We also need to expand the research literature on personality and psychological characteristics necessary for success in a different culture. All of that cited at the Conference was of Asian students in the West and Western students in Asia. How about Asian students in other Asian cultures?

We also need to consider whether UMAP, ERASMUS, TEMPUS, "COLUMBUS" and similar arrangements challenge the traditional roles and missions of higher education. These new structures certainly place a new emphasis on university education and I believe they

suggest new ways of thinking about higher education's missions of instruction, research, and service. We also need to develop, display and analyze data on international students and staff worldwide by both sending and receiving nations in new formats to assist us in strategic planning for international student enrollments in each country.

Attachments:

	A	**Conference Program**
	B	**Agenda**
	C	**Minutes and Related Documents**
	D	**Questionnaire Survey on Impediments to University Student Exchange**
	E	**"Educational and Training Services for Export Now"**

Attachment A

'92 Seoul International Conference

on

The Role of University Education in the Asia/Pacific Age

April 8-10, 1992

Convention Center
Seoul Hilton International

Hosted by
The Korean Council for University Education(KCUE)

Sponsored by
The Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea
The Federation of Korean Industries

HE 025841

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Program of the Conference

April 8 (Wednesday)

13:00-14:30 **Registration**
Venue: Convention Center

14:30-15:00 **Opening Ceremony**
Master of Ceremony:
Prof. Wha-kuk Lee, Moderator of the Conference, KCUE
Introduction to the Conference
Dr. Kyung-kun Har, Chairman of the Organizing Committee
Opening Address
Dr. Young-shik Park, Chairman of KCUE and President, Yonsei University
Welcome Address
Dr. Hie-jip Kim, Chairman Elect of KCUE and President, Korea University
Congratulatory Address
Dr. Won-shik Chung, Prime Minister, Republic of Korea

15:00-16:30 **Plenary Session (I)**
Chairman: *Dr. Ik-dong Kim, President, Kyungbuk National University, Korea*
"The Internationalization of the University"
Dr. David P.Gardner, President, University of California, U.S.A.
"The Necessity of International Cooperation among Universities"
Dr. Akito Arima, President, University of Tokyo, Japan

16:30-17:00 **Coffee Break**

17:00-18:20 **Plenary Session (II)**
Chairman: *Dr. Lawrence W. Nichol, Vice-Chancellor, Australian National University, Australia*
"Interdependence and Cooperation in the Asia/Pacific Age: Technology, Trade and Role of University"
Dr. Kwan Lee, Chairman, Presidential Commission on the 21st Century, Korea
"Educating Tomorrows Asia/Pacific Citizens"
Dr. Kenneth R. McKinnon, Chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee, Australia

18:30-20:00 **Reception** hosted by *the Chairman of KCUE*
Venue: Grand Ballroom

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

April 9 (Thursday)

09:30-11:30 Group Session (Presentations and Discussion)

Section 1.The Exchange of Faculty and Students among Universities.

Venue : Convention Center, Room B

Chairman: *Dr. Soo-gon Kim, President, Chonbuk National University, R.O.K*

Rapporteur: *Mr. Fredrick Carriere, Executive Director, Korean-American Educational Commission.*

Paper Presentations:

"The Psychological Propensity of the Ideal Exchange Students"
Prof. David Whittaker, The University of British Columbia, Canada

"Students and Faculty Exchange of Korean Universities"
Prof. Hak-chong Lee, Yonsei University, R.O.K.

"Exchange and Cooperation among Universities in the Asia/Pacific Region"
Dr. Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Secretary General, The Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning(ASAIHL), Thailand

"The Exchange of Faculty and Students at Universities in the Asia/Pacific Region: The University of Hawaii as a Case Study"
Prof. Edward R. Beauchamp, University of Hawaii, U.S.A.

Section 2.International Exchange of Academic Information among Universities.

Venue: Grand Ballroom, Room A

Chairman: *Dr. Sang Joo Lee, President, University of Ulsan, R.O.K.*

Rapporteur: *Dr. Denis Blight, Executive Director, International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges, Australia*

Paper Presentations:

"Academic Information Exchange among Universities in the Asia/Pacific Region"
Prof. Brian Wilson, Vice-Chancellor, The University of Queensland, Australia

"In Search of New Mode of University Cooperation in the Asia/Pacific Region"
Dr. Jeoung Keun Lee, Executive Director, Research Institute of Higher Education, KCUE, R.O.K.

"Academic Information Exchange between Australia and the Philippines through the ASAIHL Network"
Dr. Terestia Quirino, President, Technological Institute of the Philippines

"Nationalism and Academic Exchange"
Dr. Duane Vorhees, Korea University

"The Role of Le Iunivesite Aoao o Samoa(The National University of Samoa) and Early Signs of a Network by Satellite Telecommunication for Academic Information Exchange among Universities"
Tau'ili'ili Uili, Vice-Chancellor, The National University of Samoa

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section 3. Enhancement of Mutual Cooperation between Universities and Business/Industry

Venue: Grand Ballroom, Room C

Chairman: *Dr. Ran-soo Kim, President, Kwangju University, R.O.K.*

Rapporteur: *Dr. John Hinchcliff, Director, Auckland Institute of Technology, New Zealand*

Paper Presentations:

"Present Situation and Future Directions of Cooperative Education in Korea"
Dr. Mu-keun Lee, Professor of Vocational Education, Seoul National University

"Linkage between Higher Education and OJT, and the Necessity of Private Sectors' Participation"
Prof. Takeshi Yanagisawa, Shibaura Institute of Technology, Japan

"New Directions for College and Industry/Business Partnership: The Possibility of Andraversity and Televersity"
Dr. Hyun-chong Lee, Visiting Researcher, University of California, Berkeley

"University-Industry Interaction: NTU's Experience"
Dr. Tao Soon Chan, President, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

11:30-11:50 **Coffee Break**

11:50-12:30 **Roundup Session** (Reports of the Rapporteurs and General Discussion)
Venue: Convention Center, Room B
Chairman: *Prof. Leslie C. Holborow, Vice Chancellor, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand*
Section 1: *Mr. Fredrick Carriere, Executive Director, Korean-American Educational Commission.*
Section 2: *Dr. Denis Blight, Executive Director, International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges, Australia*
Section 3: *Dr. John Hinchcliff, Director, Auckland Institute of Technology, New Zealand*

12:40-14:00 **Luncheon** hosted by *Dr. Wan-kyoo Cho, Minister of Education, R.O.K.*
Venue: Convention Center, Room A

14:00-18:00 **Reference Group Meeting**
Venue: Convention Center, Room C

18:30-20:00 **Dinner** hosted by *Dr. Kyung Kun Han, Chairman of the Organizing Committee*
Venue: Convention Center, Room A

April 10(Friday)

Social Events for the Foreign Participants

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEETING OF REFERENCE GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

TO BE HELD IN SEOUL ON THURSDAY 9 APRIL 1992

AGENDA

1. WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS BY DR KYUNG-KUN HAR, CHAIRMAN OF THE '92 SEOUL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ORGANISING COMMITTEE AND PRESIDENT OF CHUNG-ANG UNIVERSITY

2. APPOINTMENT OF MEETING CHAIRMAN FOR DISCUSSIONS OF REFERENCE GROUP

3. REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 1991 CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

4. REPORT ON MEETING OF WORKING PARTY ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION HELD IN BANGKOK, 3 - 5 DECEMBER 1991

5. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE ACTION REQUIRED IN LIGHT OF DECISIONS ON WORKING PARTY'S RECOMMENDATIONS

6. FUTURE MEETINGS

7. OTHER BUSINESS

8. CONCLUDING SESSION - SUMMARY BY MEETING CHAIRMAN

HE 025 841

MEETING OF REFERENCE GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION - 9 APRIL 1992

AGENDA ITEM 4

REPORT ON MEETING OF WORKING PARTY ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION - HELD IN BANGKOK, 3 -5 DECEMBER 1991

Attached, for the convenience of participants in the meeting of the Reference Group, is a copy of the report prepared following the December 1991 meeting in Bangkok, of the Working Party set up by the Reference Group when it met in Canberra in September 1991.

The Working Party was appointed after the participants in the Canberra meeting had established themselves as a Reference Group on Higher Education Co-operation in the Asia/Pacific Region and declared their commitment to, and support for, increased intra-regional mobility of students and staff. Terms of reference were agreed for the Working Party which was asked do some further work and prepare some recommendations for consideration by the Reference Group at its next meeting. After some preparatory work the Working Party met in Bangkok from 3 to 5 December and came to the view that UMAPS (University Mobility in the Asia/Pacific Scheme) as generally envisaged at the Canberra meeting should be implemented as soon as possible.

The attention of the Reference Group is drawn to the addition of a final 'S' (standing for 'Scheme') in the acronym UMAPS, compared with the tentatively agreed UMAP which was decided upon in Canberra. As people began to use the acronym or full title after the Canberra meeting the word 'project' or, more often, the word 'scheme' were invariably added as a perceived need to complete the title. It was for this reason that the word 'scheme' was used in the papers leading up to the Bangkok meeting where it was accepted, seemingly, as a natural addition. It has been pointed out since, however, that it is a departure from the initially agreed title which will need either to be endorsed or dropped. A decision on this matter is sought later in this paper.

The report of the Working needs to be carefully considered by the Reference Group and attention is drawn, below to those matters on which the Group is invited to make decisions during this meeting.

It can be said here, by way of introduction and in summary, that the Working Party noted that there are many other arrangements operating within the region which enable some linking and exchanges to occur. The general view, however, was that more positive steps needed to be taken and that UMAPS offered a practicable and effective way of achieving urgently needed enhancement of the co-operation which is already in place. UMAPS was seen as an appropriate means of introducing an action-oriented scheme which would benefit higher education institutions and, through the institutions, the countries and territories within which the institutions are located. It was agreed therefore to recommend that a limited number of trial projects developed along lines suggested by the Working Party be introduced as soon as possible. These projects would be kept under continuing review and varied as necessary to achieve the degree and quality of higher education co-operation considered appropriate by the countries and territories in the region.

This paper has been prepared to direct the attention of Reference Group members to key sections of the report so that they can decide the most appropriate ways of increasing the quantity and quality of co-operation between the higher education institutions in the region. Towards the end of the paper a number issues on which decisions are desirable have been listed so that the decision can be taken either as each matter is discussed or at a later stage of the discussions.

1. **Existing Agreements (p.2 of report):**

The Working Party had access to the data presented to the conference in Canberra on agreements between institutions, governments, systems and organisations. Not all countries or territories participating in the Reference Group have provided information but there is probably ample to indicate the variety of forms that the agreements take. The Working Party observed that the amount and quality of activities undertaken in terms of agreements varied considerably but accepted that all could provide useful frameworks within which effective co-operation could be achieved.

Those members who participated in the Canberra meeting will have information on the kinds of agreements which have been made. For their convenience, however, and for the information of others, some examples of the kinds of agreements in place have been provided (under Tab 9). The Working Party did not attempt to make any judgements about which were the most appropriate and it is not suggested that those included under Tab 9 are anything other than representative of the many agreements that institutions and governments have made.

The Working Party did not recommend any specific further action with respect to these agreements.

The Reference Group may think that it would be helpful for the Working Party to look further at the kinds of agreements which have been drawn up with a view to selecting some which it believes are the kind that could serve as models for future agreements.

2. **Possible Impediments to Mobility (p.2-4):**

The general view of the Working Party was that many of the identified impediments could be overcome in the course of bi-lateral discussions between institutions seeking to agree on mutually acceptable conditions for exchanges of students and/or staff. The report refers briefly to each of the possible impediments and comments briefly on the extent to which measures recommended by the Working Party would take account of them.

For the assistance of the Reference Group, Professor Yamazawa has reviewed the possible impact of impediments further since the Working Party meeting. His contribution is included among these papers under Tab 10 and the Reference Group is invited to consider Professor Yamazawa's paper and any further advice he may wish to offer before taking decisions on the various recommendations contained in the report of the Working Party. In the light of Professor Yamazawa's advice the Reference Group may wish to request the Working Party to do some further work in order to be able to suggest ways of overcoming the most difficult of the impediments.

3. **Introduction (p.5):**

Since the report of the Working Party was prepared it has been pointed out that the statements in the second paragraph may be incorrect and that there is no clear definition of the region which would provide a basis for the percentage figure (64) mentioned in the paragraph. These statements should probably be deleted from any subsequent effort to give a rationale for the project.

4. **Recommendation (p.5):**

This is the general recommendation of the Working Party for the introduction of a pilot scheme in which a small number of countries or territories might be prepared to participate. The pilot projects would be kept under continuing review and varied as necessary to achieve the kind of higher education co-operation desired for the region from a permanent UMAPS. The Reference Group will no doubt defer a decision on the recommendation until later in the meeting when it has considered the conditions recommended for the operation of a pilot scheme.

5. Objectives (p.5-6):

The Working Party agreed on the statement of objectives for UMAPS and these are set out in the report. The Reference Group will need to consider their suitability before beginning to look at the framework recommended for pilot UMAPS programs.

6. Framework of Pilot UMAPS Programs (p.6-9):

The Working Party agreed upon a series of matters relating to the way in which UMAPS programs could function and believed that the best way to test their suitability would be through experience gained in trial programs which would serve as pilots for the eventual establishment of educational mobility programs appropriate to the region. Members of the Working Party hoped that institutions and governments in some countries and territories might be prepared to participate in pilot programs. This would require them to approve, tentatively, the framework recommended for the pilot scheme and to be able to identify limited funding sources to provide the subsidies which students and staff would almost certainly need for them to be able to participate. It was thought that, if there was general agreement at the Seoul conference that the recommended framework, or a slightly modified one, was suitable for a pilot scheme, a few countries and territories might be able to indicate during the conference, or very soon afterwards, their willingness to take part in a pilot project.

Requirements for Participation in Pilot Scheme

The basic requirements for participation in the recommended UMAPS pilot program are suggested to be:

a) Agreement by one or more institutions in a country or territory, after consultation with their government, that there would be benefits from participation in a scheme along the lines recommended by the Working Party with the aim of enhancing academic mobility in the Asia/Pacific region.

b) Agreement by the institution/s and the government of a country or territory to participate in a pilot project to test the feasibility of a scheme to apply later throughout the region.

c) Access to any funding judged necessary to supplement the contributions which can be made by students and staff who wish to participate in exchanges of the kind envisaged for the scheme. (The Working Party expected that ways of funding participation in a UMAPS pilot scheme would vary from country to country. It was thought that government financial support would be required in most cases and that business/industry funding would be a likely supplement or substitute in some cases. It was also noted that governments in

countries receiving assistance through aid programs could decide to allocate some part of such funds to assist their higher education institutions to participate in a UMAPS pilot scheme.)

d) Identification of a person or organisation to be the national contact point for the purposes of participation in a pilot UMAPS scheme. The national contact would maintain information on institutions within the country wishing to participate in exchanges, exchange this information with national contacts in other countries or territories, and liaise with the Working Party as it monitored the pilot scheme and planned future UMAPS activities.

It is suggested that the Reference Group members should look at each of the sections (i) to (vii) describing the arrangements recommended by the Working Party in order to decide whether the framework is appropriate for a pilot scheme. In doing so they would no doubt have in mind that similar measures would need to be decided eventually for any continuing UMAPS scheme which might be implemented in the light of experience gained in instituting and operating a pilot scheme.

MATTERS FOR DECISION BY REFERENCE GROUP

The Reference Group is asked to decide the following:

(i) Is it acceptable that the acronym UMAPS, standing for University Mobility in the Asia/Pacific Scheme, be used now in preference to UMAP which was tentatively agreed at the Canberra conference?

(ii) Is it desirable that the Working Party take steps to identify existing agreements between institutions/governments etc which could serve as models that others could follow?

(iii) *Is it necessary to undertake further work at this stage to identify impediments to mobility and/or to indicate ways of overcoming them?*

(iv) Is the statement of objectives for UMAPS which was agreed by the Working Party and is set out on pages 5 and 6 of its report acceptable?

(v) Is it appropriate that efforts be made to identify some projects for student and/or staff mobility and assess their suitability as a step towards determining the format for a more permanent scheme for extending and enhancing higher education co-operation in the region?

(vi) If the answer to (v) is yes, is the framework recommended by the Working Party, as set out in sections (i) to (vii) on pages 6 to 9 of its report, acceptable as a statement of the general conditions which should apply to a trial scheme, or would the Reference Group wish the Working Party to look again at some of the details of the conditions?

Reference is also made in the report of the Working Party to the promotion of UMAPS (p.10) and to future meetings (p.11). The first of these issues is raised under Agenda Item 5 - Action Required in Light of Decision on Working Party's Recommendations. The second is dealt with under Agenda Item 6 - Future Meetings.

ll480.ag4

MINUTES OF SECOND MEETING OF REFERENCE GROUP ON HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION HELD IN SEOUL ON THURSDAY 9 APRIL 1992

PARTICIPANTS

A total of fifty-one participants from eighteen countries and territories and two international organisations, and five observers, met in Seoul on Thursday 9 April 1992 for the second meeting of the Reference Group on Higher Education Co-operation in the Asia/Pacific Region which was constituted by those who attended a conference in Canberra from 17 - 19 September 1991. A list of those who participated and those who observed the second meeting is attached to these Minutes (Attachment I).

AGENDA ITEM 1 WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS

Participants were welcomed on behalf of the Korean Council for University Education by Dr Sang-joo Lee, President of the University of Ulsan. He apologised for the inability to attend of Dr Kyoung-kun Har who, as Chairman of the Organising Committee for the '92 Seoul Conference, had intended to welcome members of the Reference Group.

AGENDA ITEM 2 APPOINTMENT OF MEETING CHAIRMAN FOR DISCUSSIONS OF REFERENCE GROUP

Participants were invited by Mr John Scutt, who had been the Meeting Secretary at the Canberra Conference, to decide whom they wished to appoint to be the Meeting Chairman to preside over discussions during the remainder of the meeting.

> *In terms of a resolution moved by Professor McKinnon and seconded by Dr Wichit, participants resolved:*
>
> *That Dr Won-Sul Lee, Chairman of the National Council of Education and Former President, Hannam University, Republic of Korea, be appointed to chair the Reference Group discussions.*

Dr Won-sul Lee occupied the Chair and thanked participants for their expression of confidence in him. He encouraged all to participate in the discussions which were to follow. Participants then signified their agreement with the Chairman's suggestion that Dr Jong-seung Lee and Mr John Scutt should act jointly as the Meeting Secretaries.

AGENDA ITEM 3 REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 1991 CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION

The attention of participants was drawn to the report prepared and distributed after the September 1991 conference in Canberra.

Participants resolved:

That the Reference Group note formally the Report of the September 1991 Conference on Higher Education Co-operation in the Asia/Pacific Region, held in Canberra.

AGENDA ITEM 4 REPORT ON MEETING OF WORKING PARTY ON HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION - HELD IN BANGKOK, 3 - 5 DECEMBER 1991

The attention of participants was drawn to the report prepared by the Working Party and to the covering introductory paper that had been written to assist members of the Reference Group to focus on the issues on which it was thought that decisions were desirable. It was reported to the meeting that the members of the Working Party had come together on the day prior to the Reference Group meeting to discuss each of the matters which appeared to require decisions by the Reference Group and that suggested resolutions had been prepared to assist discussion. Members of the Reference Group accepted that it would be convenient to consider the Working Party report by focusing on each of six identified points and discussed them in turn.

i) Dr Ninnat introduced discussion on the most appropriate acronym to be used to identify the kinds of measures agreed upon by the Canberra conference. He pointed to the undesirable associations which the word 'scheme' has in some countries in the region. He suggested that it would be preferable not to use 'UMAPS', in which the final 'S' stands for 'Scheme', and that it would be more generally acceptable to use 'UMAP'.

On the basis of a form of words proposed by Dr Ninnat, the Reference Group resolved:

That the acronym UMAP, standing for University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific, be endorsed as the name of the project set in train by the Canberra conference of September 1991 and discussed further in Seoul in April 1992.

ii) Professor McKinnon introduced discussion on the desirability of collecting further examples of the various kinds of agreements which have been concluded between institutions and other parties within the region as a basis for their co-operation. He suggested that it would be useful to do so and points made by others who contributed to the discussion indicated that this view was widely shared. It was thought that some work by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Working Party, to identify various types of agreements would make the collection more useful.

In accordance with a resolution moved by Professor McKinnon and seconded by Dr Wichit, the Reference Group resolved:

That the Working Party be requested to seek examples of agreements for international co-operation between institutions, governments and organisations with a view to selecting a number, of various types, which are judged to be of sufficiently long standing and to be sufficiently effective, to be reproduced for use by countries and institutions interested in negotiating new agreements.

iii) Professor Yamazawa was invited by the Chairman to speak to his paper, which had been previously circulated, reviewing the effects of the various impediments identified at the Canberra meeting in the light of Japan's experience with international

exchanges. The discussion which followed revealed that participants would be assisted by some further work in this area.

In accordance with a resolution moved by Professor Yamazawa and seconded by Dr Abueva, the Reference Group resolved:

That the Working Party oversee the establishment of a small group of persons experienced in international exchange programs, to identify possibly serious impediments to exchanges and study best practices in overcoming them with a view to recommending practical solutions which would facilitate university mobility in the Asia/Pacific region.

iv) The Reference Group then proceeded to consider the suitability of the objectives for UMAP as recommended by the Working Party. It was agreed that the objectives as drafted by the Working Party were generally acceptable but that it would be desirable to remove the two headings which were thought to be unnecessary, and to include a phrase referring to extended and enhanced co-operation between institutions.

In accordance with a resolution moved by Dr Wichit and seconded by Dr Quirino, the Reference Group resolved:

That the following be endorsed as the Objectives of UMAP -

The general objective of UMAP is to achieve, by extended and enhanced co-operation between higher education institutions, a better understanding within each of the countries and territories in the Asia/Pacific region of the cultural, economic and social systems of the other countries and territories in the region, by increasing the mobility of higher education students and staff and improving the quality of higher education in the region.

In order to move towards achievement of the general objective of UMAP, the program is also intended to:

1. *Increase significantly the number of active bilateral agreements among higher education institutions, and consortiums of institutions and others, in the Asia/Pacific region and by such means to foster internationalisation of curricula and teaching through exchanges of students and staff.*

2. *Develop a rapidly expanding program of student mobility based on bilateral and consortium agreements, with the period of student residence in another country being of a duration sufficient to allow at least an appropriate language/acculturation course plus a regular undergraduate semester.*

3. *Overcome progressively the impediments to higher education student mobility, by agreements between individual institutions and organisations, reinforced by supportive government action where necessary.*

4. *Foster bilateral institution/business enterprise relationships in countries of the region on co-operative education and/or work placement models, including allowing students to take a period of work experience in an enterprise in a country within the region as part of an accredited course.*

5. *Establish, over an appropriate time scale , a small and cost effective organisational structure comprising identified co-ordinating organisations in each country or territory, a representative group to guide UMAP policies*

and practices, and a minimum-sized secretariat located in a suitable centrally situated city.

v) Discussion commenced on the recommendation of the Working Party that some projects for staff and/or student mobility of the kind envisaged for UMAP should be identified and their suitability assessed as a step towards determining the format for a more permanent means of extending higher education co-operation in the region. In considering this issue participants canvassed matters that were also relevant to the important issue of the framework for a trial program on which the Working Party had made a number of detailed recommendations.

On the basis of a resolution moved by Professor McKinnon and seconded by Dr Scott the Reference Group resolved:

That steps be taken to identify institutions and/or countries prepared to nominate some projects for student and/or staff mobility which are generally consistent with the framework decided upon by the Reference Group in April 1992 for a trial UMAP program, and to assess the suitability of the framework as a step towards determining formats for a more permanent program for extending and enhancing higher education co-operation in the region.

vi) Participants discussed a wide range of issues in considering the framework recommended by the Working Party and set out in sections (i) to (vii) on pages 6 to 9 of its report. Points were made in ways which were intended to be positive in the light of the generally held view that some trial programs should be identified and assessed. Suggestions were made on modifications which would be needed to take account of additional considerations introduced by the Reference Group. There was general agreement that new wording was needed in respect of the sections noted below in order to have a framework acceptable to the Reference group (The references are to the sections in the Working Party's report with the same numbers and on the pages indicated):

i) Participating Countries or Territories (P.6 and 7 of Working Party's report)

First dot point on P.6

It was agreed that the framework should allow for the possibility that, initially, one or two institutions or an organisation of institutions may wish to participate in a trial program before the government concerned has fully considered whether it would wish to be directly involved.

Second dot point on P.7

It was agreed that more flexibility was needed so that a wider range of contributing levels would be possible. Participants wished to provide for the possibility of proportionately lower levels if, for example, one institution only were to be involved and, perhaps, for contributions by way of greater service instead of cash.

ii) UMAP Working Party (P.7 of Working Party's Report)

Fourth dot point in that section on P.7

It was agreed that it would be preferable to alter the wording to make the intention clear that a UMAP program would complement and supplement existing arrangements.

(vi) Eligibility for Participation in UMAP Programs (P.9 of Working Party's report)

First dot point in that section, on P.9.

It was agreed that an amendment was necessary to ensure that reputable providers of higher education courses in countries or territories in which there were no national accreditation procedures were not prevented from participating in a trial program.

Fifth dot point in that section, on P.9

It was agreed that amendment was necessary to permit the maximum flexibility in regard to the amount of credit to be given and that the explanatory remarks in the latter part of the section as drafted were inappropriate.

In accordance with a resolution moved by Professor Yamazawa and seconded by Professor McKinnon, the Reference Group resolved:

i) That the framework as recommended by the Working Party which met in Bangkok in December 1991, and set out in Sections (i) to (vii) on pages 6 to 9 of its report, as amended by a drafting group and approved by the Working Party meeting later that day, be agreed as the basis of the general conditions which should apply for the implementation of a trial UMAP program.

ii) That the drafting group should comprise Dr Abueva, Professor Holborow, Dr Ninnat, Professor McKinnon and Professor Yamazawa.

In accordance with the decision of the Reference Group, appropriate amendments were prepared by the drafting group and approved by the Working Party. Attachment II to these Minutes re-states the details of the 'Framework of Trial UMAP Programs' and incorporates the amendments requested by the Reference Group.

AGENDA ITEM 5 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE ACTION REQUIRED IN LIGHT OF DECISION ON WORKING PARTY'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Members of the Reference Group were aware of the agreement at the Canberra meeting that they should take every opportunity to obtain the support of governments and appropriate private and public sector organisations for their plans to extend higher education co-operation. Ms Lipp informed the Group of the kind of action which had been taken and planned by Australian Government authorities to inform governments and inter-governmental bodies in the region of UMAP.

On the basis of a resolution moved by Dr Quirino and seconded by Dr Ninnat, the Reference Group resolved:

i) That the Working Party be requested to inform the various relevant international agencies of the agreement by the Reference Group at its Seoul meeting to introduce a trial UMAP program.

ii) That all members of the Reference Group be asked to inform their governments and other appropriate authorities within their countries, of the trial UMAP program and take whatever steps they can to gain the support of the governments and agencies for their participation in trial programs.

AGENDA ITEM 6 FUTURE MEETINGS

The Reference Group noted that the Working Party had initiated some enquiries and discussions about the timing and venues of meetings leading up to the 1994 Reference Group meeting which the Canberra meeting had tentatively agreed should be held in Japan. Members were informed that the matter had been further discussed by the Working Party at its meeting which had taken place on the previous day and that the Working Party wished to recommend that the Reference Group take advantage of an offer for a meeting to be hosted in Taipei in April 1993. Dr Tsong-Shien Wu, who represented Dr Chen Sun, President of the National Taiwan University, at the Reference Group meeting, extended on Dr Chen Sun's behalf, an invitation to have the next Reference Group meeting take place in Taipei.

The Reference Group resolved:

That the Reference Group accept with gratitude the kind offer of Dr Chen Sun, President of National Taiwan University, to have the Reference Group meet next in Taipei, in late April 1993.

The suggestion was made that the choosing of an appropriate theme often added to the effectiveness of a conference. It was agreed that anyone wishing to offer a suggestion on what might be an appropriate theme for the Taipei meeting should give it to Dr Wu.

AGENDA ITEM 7 OTHER BUSINESS

Three additional matters were dealt with under this Agenda Item.

i) Re-convening of Working Party

After noting that it was desirable that work be commenced shortly on a number of matters discussed during its meeting, the Reference Group resolved:

That the Working Party be asked to reconvene as soon as possible after the Reference Group meeting in order to note the various tasks which will be required of them from the decisions taken by the Reference Group, to plan how action should be initiated to carry them out, and to decide when and where the Working Party should next meet.

ii) Expression of Appreciation for Meeting Arrangements

Professor McKinnon, on behalf of the other participants, thanked the Korean hosts for the splendid arrangements which they had made for the conference and for the Reference Group meeting.

Acting on a resolution proposed by Professor McKinnon the Reference Group resolved:

That the Reference Group express its sincere appreciation to the Minister of Education, the Federation of Korean Industries and the Korean Council for University Education for the excellent arrangements which had been made and the hospitality which had been provided for participants in the Seoul Conference, and that KCUE staff be thanked for the most efficient, friendly and helpful way in which they had prepared for and assisted with conduct of the conference.

REFERENCE GROUP MEETING TO DISCUSS HIGHER EDUCATION CO-OPERATION IN THE ASIA/PACIFIC REGION - SEOUL - 9 APRIL 1992

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

PARTICIPANTS

Professor K R McKinnon, President of Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and Vice-Chancellor, University of Wollongong
Professor B G Wilson, President of International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges and Vice-Chancellor, University of Queensland, Brisbane
Professor L W Nichol, Vice-Chancellor, Australian National University, Canberra
Dr D G Blight, Chief Executive, International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges, Canberra
Ms L Lipp, Assistant Secretary, International Relations Branch, Department of Employment, Education and Training, Canberra
Mr J R Scutt, Director, International Relations, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, Canberra

Mr Nirhassan Abu Bakar, Secretary and Registrar, University of Brunei Darussalam, Seri Bagawan
Professor Haji Serudin D S Haji Tinggal, Dean of Students, University of Brunei Darussalam, Seri Bagawan

Professor Pit Chamnan, Vice-Director, University of Phnom Penh

Professor D Whittaker, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver

Dr M J McCarthy, Vice-President for Planning, Development and Endowment, University of Guam

Professor W I R Davies, Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Hong Kong
Professor E J Hearn, Associate Director, Hong Kong Polytechnic
Professor Y M Yeung, Director, Institute of Asian Pacific Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong

Professor Akito Arima, President of Japan Association of National Universities and President, University of Tokyo
Professor Minoru Sumita, President, University of Electro Communications, Tokyo
Professor Ippei Yamazawa, Professor of Economics, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo
Professor Yoshio Kawashima, Dean, Faculty of Law, University of Osaka and Member of 5th Standing Committee of Japan Association of National Universities
Dr Ichiro Tanioka, Associate Professor, Osaka University of Commerce, Osaka

Dr Won-sul Lee, Chairman of the National Council of Education and Member of Board of Trustees, Korean Council for University Education, Seoul
Dr Soo-gon Kim, Vice-Chairman of the Korean Council for University Education and President, Chonbuk National University
Dr Sang-Joo Lee, President, University of Ulsan
Dr Young-kee Moe, Assistant Minister for Higher Education, Ministry of Education
Dr Jeoung-keun Lee, Executive Director of Research, Institute of Higher Education, Korean Council for University Education, Seoul
Dr Jong-seung Lee, Professor, Chung Nam National University

Mr Batboldyn Enkhtuvshin, First Vice-Minister of Education, Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar
Dr Dorji, Ulaanbaatar University
Mr Sumiyabaatar, Dankook University

Professor L C Holborow, Vice-Chancellor, Victoria University of Wellington
Dr T N M Waters, Vice-Chancellor, Massey University, Palmerston North
Mr E S Rose, Chief Executive Officer, New Zealand Education International. Wellington
Dr J Hinchcliff, Director, Auckland Institute of Technology

Professor J Sukwianomb, Vice-Chancellor, University of Papua New Guinea, Waigani

Dr Jose Abueva, President, University of the Philippines, Quezon City
Professor E R Roman, Chancellor, University of Philippines, Quezon City
Dr T Quirino, Chairman of the Philippines Council of ASAIHL and President, Technological Institute of the Philippines

Professor A Savelyev, Director of the Research Institute of Problems of Higher Education, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow
Mr A Pankin, Leading Inspector, Foreign Relations Directorate, Presidium of Russian Academy of Education, Moscow

Professor Tau'ili'ili Uili Meredith, Vice-Chancellor, National University of Samoa, Apia

Dr Cham Tao Soon, President, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Dr Tsong-shien Wu, Dean, National Taiwan University, Taipei
Dr Kwang-Cheng Chang, President, Chung Yuan Christian University, Chung Li

Dr Wichit Srisa-an, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of University Affairs, Thailand, Bangkok
Mr Charas Suwanwela, President, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok
Dr Witaya Jeradechakul, Vice-President, Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok
Dr Thanu Kulachol, President, Association of Private Higher Education Institutions of Thailand and President, Bangkok University

Professor E R Beauchamp, Professor, College of Education, University of Hawaii
Dr R A Scott, Chairman, American Council on Education, and President, Ramapo College of NJ

Dr Ninnat Olanvoravuth, Secretary-General, Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning, Bangkok
Mr Hedayat Ahmed, Director, Principal Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific of UNESCO, Bangkok

Dr I T Goodine, Director, Colombo Plan Staff College for Technician Education, Pasig, Manila

OBERVERS

Dr G R Li, Director, Office of International Programs and Services, University of Hawaii, Honolulu
Dr T Barrlett, Chancellor, Oregon State System of Higher Education, USA
Mr B Kremenak, Senior Research Scholar, University of Maryland, USA
Ms S deBoer, Kwanju University, Korea

iii) **Thanks to Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee**

Professor Wichit wished to have noted the contribution which the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee had made in the lead-up to the Seoul meeting.

In terms of a resolution proposed by Dr Wichit, the Reference Group resolved:

That the Reference Group express its thanks to the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee for the work it had done since the Canberra meeting in September 1991 to assist the implementation of the decisions taken at that meeting which were aimed at enhancing higher education co-operation in the Asia/Pacific region.

The meeting was concluded at approximately 5.30 pm.

ll589-1.min

FRAMEWORK OF TRIAL UMAP PROGRAMS

At its meeting in Seoul on 9 April 1992, the Reference Group on Higher Education Co-operation in the Asia/Pacific Region agreed that trial UMAP programs should be commenced in accordance with the arrangements described below:

(i) Participating Countries or Territories

- Any country or territory within the region having institutions engaged in programs meeting the conditions laid down for recognition under UMAP may indicate that it is a participating country.

- Any institution or organisation of institutions which wishes to participate in the UMAP trial program must indicate its willingness to meet the obligations laid down for a participating country.

- A participating country will be entitled to be a member of the UMAP Working Party to oversee the trial program.

- A participating country will be required to pay the costs of its attendance at UMAP Working Party Meetings (which would be held twice each year - one meeting in conjunction with a Reference Group meeting and another some six months later).

- In addition a participating country will be required to pay an annual contribution to fund a work program. The precise amount and form of the contribution would be determined by the UMAP Working Party in the light of the agreed tasks to be undertaken.

- A participating country will be required to maintain a register of agreements made in terms of UMAP by institutions in the country with institutions in other countries participating in UMAP, and a record of all student and staff movements made in terms of the agreements.

- A participating country will be required to nominate a person or organisation to be the national contact for UMAP purposes. The national contact will maintain the information relating to agreements and movements under UMAP and provide summarised data to the UMAP Working Party in the form agreed by the Working Party to be the basic data required for overall monitoring of UMAP.

(ii) UMAP Working Party

- The trial UMAP program will be directed by the UMAP Working Party comprised of representatives of each of the countries or territories participating in the trial program.

- The first task of the UMAP Working Party will be to implement the trial program in accordance with decisions taken by the Reference Group at the Seoul meeting. It will meet immediately after the Seoul Conference in order to begin its task.

- The Working Party will have a combined planning and monitoring role as the trial project begins to operate. It will meet in October 1992 to review progress to that time.

- The Working Party will liaise with other organisations involved in staff and student mobility projects in order to ensure that UMAP programs complement and supplement existing arrangements.

- The Working Party will engage in activities to promote UMAP among institutions, governments and government and non-government organisations.

- Initially the secretariat services for the Working Party will be provided by staff based in the AVCC office in Canberra, Australia.

- The secretariat services will be limited to the minimum necessary to support the Working Party as it monitors the UMAP program, acts as a liaison point, provides a clearing house function and plans future UMAP activities.

(iii) Criteria for Recognition of UMAP Project

- Staff or student exchange schemes operating under agreements already in place which conform with the aims of UMAP and satisfy the other criteria for UMAP projects will be recognised as UMAP projects if the institutions/countries involved wish to have them so identified.

- Institutions/countries may determine their own priorities with respect to the nature of exchanges they would like to arrange and register their priorities with the UMAP Working Party. It is not thought necessary or appropriate that any priority areas should be determined at this stage for the operation of the trial UMAP.

- The expectation is that most agreements negotiated under UMAP will be bilateral, between institutions, but agreements between governments, systems or organisations, or combinations of parties could also be appropriate.

- A high degree of reciprocity will be needed in order to persuade institutions and governments of the benefits of participation in UMAP. This need not, however, be complete reciprocity measured in terms of perfect matches, each year; between parts of institutions; across whole institutions; or between countries. As the program is based upon acceptance by the various parties of the terms of any exchange agreements, there need only be a sufficient degree of reciprocity to satisfy the needs of the parties involved in a particular agreement.

- For recognition as a UMAP project, an agreement will need to have taken proper account of the obligations of home and host institutions as set out in the sections which follow.

(iv) Obligations of HOME Institutions which are Parties to a Project to be Recognised Under UMAP

Home institutions, using criteria accepted for bilateral or other kinds of agreements covering the UMAP programs:

- Will select students and staff to participate.

- Will approve the study programs, including language courses/training, to be undertaken by participating students and staff.

- Will recognise work completed overseas for credit towards awards of the home institution.

- Will determine the level of financial support to be given to participating students and staff.

- Will provide appropriate preparatory courses for their students and staff, prior to their departure.

(v) **Obligations of HOST Institutions which are Parties to a Project to be Recognised under UMAP**

Host institutions, using criteria accepted for UMAP programs:

- Will provide the agreed study programs for participating staff and students.

- Will evaluate the performance of participants and report to home institutions.

- Will provide appropriate counselling and other support services to participants.

- Will assist participating students and staff to obtain accommodation at reasonable cost.
- Will ensure that appropriate health care arrangements are made in respect of participating staff and students.

- Will take action with the appropriate authorities in the host country to facilitate the issue of visas and compliance with entry requirements.

- Will ensure appropriate access by participating students and staff to libraries, laboratories, and similar facilities.

- Will provide any necessary language training.

(vi) **Eligibility for Participation in UMAP Programs**

- All public or private higher education institutions located in countries or territories participating in UMAP, and recognised in the participating home country as nationally accredited, or as reputable providers of higher education courses, will be eligible to participate in UMAP programs.

- Each country will make available to the Working Party its list of accredited public and private higher education institutions.

- UMAP programs will operate between individual accredited higher education institutions, or consortiums of institutions, on the basis of mutual acceptance of the appropriateness of national accreditation determinations.

- Undergraduate and postgraduate students and staff of accredited institutions will be eligible to participate in UMAP projects.

- Students who are selected to participate in UMAP projects would generally be eligible to receive credit of one semester, or up to a maximum of one years work, in the home institution.

(vii) Funding of UMAP Programs

- It is expected that ways of funding participation in UMAP projects will vary within and between participating countries to take account of the varying methods of funding institutions and the existing capacities of institutions and countries to meet the costs of their involvement in UMAP.

- In most cases participating staff and students will be required to make some contribution to the costs of their participation in a UMAP project.

- Agreements will be needed between institutions and governments on a number of matters. The principal ones identified by the Working Party to date include:

  (a) will students in receipt of scholarships, allowances etc be permitted to retain these benefits while studying in another country towards the same home institution award for which they initially enrolled;

  (b) whether institutions will be able to waive fees in respect of students coming from overseas, on acceptably reciprocal terms, as part of a UMAP program;

  (c) whether, and to what extent, governments of participating countries will recognise and fund the additional administrative costs which institutions will incur in participating in UMAP;

  (d) what forms of additional financial support will governments of participating countries make available to subsidise the costs of students and staff studying overseas under UMAP;

  (e) to what extent will institutions and/or governments be able to obtain funds to support participation in UMAP from private sources such as business and industry (including airlines which might be willing to offer free or discounted travel);

  (f) will institutions and/or governments be able to obtain funds from aid programs, either bilateral or multi-lateral, to assist participation in UMAP.

- After discussions and decisions on matters of the kind referred to in the previous item, institutions will need to determine the conditions on which staff and student participation will be possible.

LL585.DOC

UMAP

UNIVERSITY MOBILITY IN ASIA/PACIFIC

TELEPHONE: (06) 285 8200
International: 61-6-285 8200

FAX: (06) 285 8211
International: 61-6-285 8211

June 1992

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY ON IMPEDIMENTS TO UNIVERSITY STUDENT EXCHANGE

This survey aims to collect information on active international student exchange programs of Asia Pacific universities and identify impediments to the mobility of students between universities.

The desirability of conducting the survey was agreed by the 2nd UMAP Reference Group Meeting in Seoul on April 9th, 1992, and I was entrusted with the conduct of the survey in collaboration with practising experts in international student exchange programs in the region.

In this questionnaire survey, *each university* or a *particular faculty* is expected to fill out the current state of its *active* exchange programs with foreign universities either in or outside the Asia Pacific region. We are interested in your programs of sending your students abroad or receiving foreign students (both under-graduate and graduate) in non-degree status for the period of one semester or one academic year. We do not plan to include the period of one semester or one academic year. We do not plan to include all universities and faculties but a few or several typical (progressive) universities/faculties - natural science, engineering, social science, and humanity in each country. Your collaboration is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Ippei Yamazawa
Professor
Hitotsubashi University
and Japan Association of
National Universities.

PART I GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please identify your institution

University/faculty:

Address/Telephone/Telefax:

Name of respondent with title:

C/- AVCC, 1 - 5 Geils Court, DEAKIN ACT 2600, Australia
(GPO Box 1142, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia)

HE 025 841

2. **Size of your institution: Total number (Number____ per year X____ years)**

3. **Your academic calendar**

Semester system: I (date __/__ to __/__) II (__/__ to __/__)

Examination period: _____ _____

Quarter system: I (__/__ to __/__) II (__/__ to __/__) III (__/__ to __/__)

Examination period: _____ _____ _____

PART II RECEIVING FOREIGN STUDENTS

4. How many foreign students do you receive every year?

. Degree Students: (how long on average_____)

. Non-degree Students

. Number:

. Countries:

. Duration: one academic year ( ), one semester ( ), one quarter ( )

5. How many courses do your non-degree foreign students take on average?

. Number:

Please explain your credit unit:

(_____ hours X_____ weeks) makes one credit unit.

. Do you report their credits to their home universities? ( )
Or do students report by themselves? ( )

6. Language requirements:

. Do you teach all courses in your language?

(identify your language)

. Do you teach some courses in other than your language?

(identify the language)

. Do you provide a supplementary language program to your foreign students?

Are your foreign students proficient enough to study in courses given in your language? Tick relevant item.

Proficient ( ) Good but yet handicapped ( ) Incapable ( )

7. How are your foreign students (non-degree) supported financially? (Tick relevant items and give the student numbers)

University funds ( )_____

Government Scholarship ( )_____

Self funded ( )_____

Others: (Please specify)

Do your foreign students work part-time to supplement their funds?

8. How do your foreign students live?

University dormitory ( ), its average rent monthly _____

Private lodge ( ), its average rent monthly _____

9. How do you admit your non-degree foreign students? (Tick relevant items)

Selected on the basis of language proficiency ( )

Selected on the basis of academic record ( )

recommended by student's home university ( )

PART III SENDING YOUR STUDENTS ABROAD

10. Number of your students going abroad (non-degree)

Numbers:

Host countries:

Duration:

11. Does the difference in academic calendar discourage your students studying abroad?

12. Do you accept the credits your students obtain abroad?

Does your curriculum accommodate your students studying abroad? Or, do your students have to prolong their graduation by the period of studying abroad?

13. **How are your students funded for their studying abroad? (Tick relevant items and give the numbers of students)**

University funds ( )_____

Government scholarship ( )_____

Self funded ( )_____

Others (please specify)

14. Do your students have difficulty in obtaining student visas for studying abroad?

15. What do you regard as the hardest impediment to the international mobility of university students (either mentioned or not mentioned above)?

Questionnaire ends. Thank you very much.

"Educational and Training Services for Export Now"
Dr. Robert A. Scott, President
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Introduction

To most observers, the U. S. system of higher education is the envy of the world. It offers, with quality, greater diversity of programs, institutional types and missions, revenue sources, and styles of governance than any other nation. U. S. institutions offer more opportunities for access to higher learning, have a greater commitment to accountability through accreditation, and more independence for institutional action than is common throughout the world. How do we know? One answer is provided by the 408,000 students from other countries who study at U. S. institutions each year. Another is provided by the arrangements made by foreign firms to send employees to U. S. colleges and universities.

In the traditional view, these colleges and universities are devoted to teaching and research. For this reason most institutions are viewed as "Ivory Towers," more apart from than a part of society.

In recent years, observers from both the public and private sectors have commented on higher education as part of the nation's infrastructure like transportation and communication links, and essential for economic competitiveness. In a recent report, the Board of Regents of the State University of New York commented as follows:

> The United States cannot deal successfully with international economic policy without knowledge of the cultural context within which various economies work. Nor can it address global environmental, population, or political problems without the ability to communicate freely with other peoples. We must understand the perspectives of other groups that are rooted in tradition, religion and internal relationships. Educational institutions and organizations are in the best position to educate and train our citizens to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to understand other peoples and be able to work comfortably with them.

Invited presentation at "Export Services Now Conference" sponsored by the U. S. Department of Commerce and the New Jersey District Export Council, March 9, 1989, Chubb World Headquarters

That's a useful view, but it, too, is still limited. We should view higher education not only as a part of the infrastructure, but also as service to be exported. This is not just a matter of attitude and perspective, but also a matter of strategy, focus, and follow-through. The elements for success already exist, but there is no overall strategy. In fact, if we don't act soon, we could lose our

competitive advantage and turn our opportunity for export into a necessity for import -- especially of faculty, scholars and students in the sciences and engineering.

Higher Education as an Industry

Colleges and universities in the United States number 3300, enroll 12 million students, employ 700,000 faculty and staff, manage $115 billion in physical facilities and equipment, offer thousands of degree programs, raise $6 billion annually in private support, and spend nearly $100 billion per year. This is a Fortune 100 enterprise if there ever was one. The 3300 institutions in this loosely knit system share a common currency of credits and are "licensed" to provide their services by six parallel regional accrediting associations.

Industry is a major client of higher education. In addition to the usual relations -- hiring graduates and sponsoring research -- college and university faculty supply a significant proportion of the $40 billion worth of corporate training offered each year.

Public policy discussions concerning trade and competitiveness recognize higher education as a necessity. The State University of New York quote suggests that! Higher education is viewed as a source of preparation, training and retraining for executives, entrepreneurs and government officials. According to the Census Bureau, some 3% of the nation's workers, 120,000 people, need retraining annually. This is a tremendous challenge for colleges, universities, career schools, and corporate training programs.

A Caveat

This is not only a challenge, but a concern as well. Even as I believe that colleges and universities can do a great deal more to enhance our nation's economic performance, I

believe our institutions must be careful not to lose their academic balance, both in terms of teaching and scholarship, and independence of action. Clark Kerr is correct to say that higher education is "subject to great tension from three conflicting imperatives: (1) to preserve its heritage; (2) to serve more effectively the cause of equality of opportunity -- the great theme of the 1960s; and (3) to serve competency in the labor market -- the great theme of the 1980s." Institutions of higher education should not promise more than they can deliver.

But they can deliver a great deal more than they do now. And what they already do could be much more effective if it were part of a strategy for competitiveness in trade. As it is, many institutions offer discrete programs and services, and no one seems concerned about the lack of a systematic approach. The 350,000 foreign students represent 3% of college enrollments. Why not 10% as a goal? This is not an argument for central control. I simply suggest that the results would be greater if we had a more systematic approach to opportunities for export.

A Strategy for Considering Higher Education as a Service to Export

A strategy for considering higher education as a service to export would include a set of goals, an assessment of current strengths and assets, an assessment of opportunities, priorities for targeted areas in the world, priorities for areas of knowledge, and a plan for coordinating the various and numerous key elements. After all, we must consider U. S. and foreign students at all levels of study, U. S. and foreign faculty and visiting scholars, programs of education, training and retraining, consulting and research, the forms of credentials offered, locations here and there, and organized information and data about all of the above.

Colleges and universities already export their services and knowledge by sending faculty and students to other countries for periods of study and research. Popular fields are agriculture and food production, business, computing, and social sciences. And institutions of higher education enroll several hundred thousand foreign students who import tuition and export ideas and values. But there is much more which can be done.

Imagine if state and regional trade groups, companies interested in export, and colleges and universities knew more about each others' strengths and opportunities, and took a coordinated approach to attaining selected goals. Just think what could be accomplished if federally-supported research labs and United States Information Agency priorities were part of the discussion for developing a state's strategy for increasing exports?

A Case Example

It is likely that those who think of higher education as a service with potential for export will think of this as a role reserved for large research universities. By citing a few examples from Ramapo College, I will show it is not.

Ramapo College enrolls foreign students who pay tuition and return to their home countries as managers, professionals, and teachers. We send students to other countries, even as coop interns. We host foreign scholars who study and teach at Ramapo, and send faculty to other countries in a similar capacity. When appropriate, our faculty and visitors meet with executives of area corporations to brief them on regional issues and opportunities.

Our faculty in China this year are planning for a teleconference designed to help Chinese and U. S. residents learn more about each other's culture. We are coordinating an effort to bring Chinese and Israeli business interests together for the first time. We have also served as consultants to advise the Shanghai Industrial Management Training Center and the English language programs of the State Bank Training Project in Indonesia. In all of these efforts, telecommunications will prove to be our competitive advantage for the future.

In cooperation with Princeton University's Princeton-In-Asia Program, we will host Asian managers and bureaucrats to teach them about American history, politics and business practices. We do the same with executives from foreign firms, and we help prepare U. S. executives for tours in other countries.

We are now developing a venture in botany with a group in Jamaica and building on our faculty expertise in Canada. Additional projects focus on Puerto Rico, Japan, Italy and the remainder of Europe.

Ramapo is special, but it is not unique in these respects. Many colleges have relations with institutions and governments in other countries, and export their experts and expertise. Each of these projects has competitors from other countries as well as from the U. S. I cite these examples not to tout Ramapo but to highlight a point. Why did we select these countries? What is our strategy?

In some cases these relationships are based on faculty interest and experience. In other cases, we provided additional training for faculty to help them develop the capacity to build new relationships. We decided on these areas by considering that we have limited resources and should pick the regions of the world with greatest relevance to our curriculum. Only after a year or two into these efforts did we begin to realize greater leverage by building on relationships already begun by the Sister State program of the N. J. Division of Trade, the high priority countries of USIA, and programs offered by groups such as the Port Authority.

By cooperating with these and other groups, we can develop still more services for export. For example, colleges could provide language and technical training for use by foreign customers of U. S.-made equipment and instrumentation. U. S. colleges and universities can work with U. S. and other firms overseas to set up graduate management programs, as is done in China. And U. S. colleges and universities can provide expertise to U. S. corporations in order for them to enhance their ability to meet environmental requirements and to advise local management on waste management, etc. The possibilities are endless.

Conclusion

Higher education has great potential as a service to export in addition to its role as part of the nation's infrastructure. We not only prepare people for an interdependent world, but also participate in it. But first, we must think of higher education as capable of this role, and build on existing strengths to develop cooperative networks and realize the potential.